



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/426,442	10/25/1999	SHARYN MARIE GARRITY	99-703	1897
32127	7590	10/23/2009		
VERIZON LEGAL DEPARTMENT PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD 9TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2525			EXAMINER BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J	
			ART UNIT 2439	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 10/23/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/426,442

Applicant(s)

GARRITY ET AL

Examiner

CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN

Art Unit

2439

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 18-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 18-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The Request for Continued Prosecution has been Accepted and Entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 27, 37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection in view of Kuhn US 6,023,765

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A process qualifies to be considered for patenting only if it (1) is implemented with a particular machine, that is, one specifically devised and adapted to carry out the process in a way that is not concededly conventional and is not trivial; or else (2) transforms an article from one thing or state to another. Claims 1, 27, and 37 are rejected because they do not contain any form of computer hardware. Inclusion of a Processor or other computer hardware consistent with the specification will overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 25, and 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims state "functionality to support desired functionality" the examiner interprets this is the broadest reasonable way to mean computer functions to support access to data. It is unclear what the applicants intention is.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 19, 20, 24, 25-27, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis US 6,367,009 in view of Schneider US 6,178,505 in view of Kuhn US 6,023,765.

As per claims 1, and 27, Davis discloses an MTS or middle tier server, verifying a users ID through a digital certificate submitted by the client, (authentication component), (Col 11 lines 39-43). Davis also discloses the ETS or end tier server verifying the users ID through use of a digital certificate, (Col 13 lines 27-31). Davis teaches that the ETS uses access

control comprising a list of authorized users, (directory), (Col 13 lines 35-39). Davis discloses that if the user is not on the access control list, the system will restrict access, (access control system), (Col 13 lines 40-42).

Schneider teaches a system in which a users are permitted access to at least one portion of a computer site. Schneider teaches a database (directory) of user accounts wherein the user is assigned a group and is allowed access to data said group is permitted to access. (Col 12 lines 10-33, 54-59).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the system of Davis with the user account access control of Schneider because ACL's do not provide the level of security and flexibility that user accounts do.

Kuhn teaches using an access policy to provide tiered access for a plurality of security levels over different sets of users (Col 6 lines 35-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Kuhn with the previous combination because it allows the convenience and organization of the role based system of Schneider with the proven security improvements of security levels (Col 5 lines 10-15).

As per claim 19, 29, Schneider teaches that users are categorized into discrete sets granted access to a particular portion of the computer according to the access policy.

As per claim 20, 30, Schnieder teaches the system is configured to use information relating to the user to present tot the user personalized information.

As per claims 24 and 34, Schneider teaches the account containing an IP address (Col 23 lines 15-25).

As per claims 25, and 35 Schneider teaches the system is configured to provide functionality to support the desired functionality of the users (Col 12 lines 20-40).

As per claims 26, 36 Davis teaches that the certificate authorization is automated (no human is involved in the process) (Col 13 lines 15-25).

Claims 21, 22, 31, 32, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis US 6,367,009 in view of Schneider US 6,178,505 in view of Kuhn US 6,023,765 in view of GUPTA US 2001/0020242.

As per claims 21, 22, 31, and 32, the previous combination teaches user groups but not specifically user preferences.

Gupta teaches user preferences, and displaying new products or information related to the users field of interest based on those preferences [0062], [0064], [0075]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the preferences of Gupta with the previous system because it is more efficient to send the user tailored information, then send general information.

As per claim 37,

Davis discloses an MTS or middle tier server, verifying a users ID through a digital certificate submitted by the client, (authentication component), (Col 11 lines 39-43). Davis also discloses the ETS or end tier server verifying the users ID through use of a digital certificate, (Col 13 lines 27-31). Davis teaches that the ETS uses access control comprising a list of authorized users, (directory), (Col 13 lines 35-39). Davis discloses that if the user is not on the access control list, the system will restrict access, (access control system), (Col 13 lines 40-42).

Schneider teaches a system in which a users are permitted access to at least one portion of a computer site. Schneider teaches a database (directory) of user accounts wherein the user is assigned a group and is allowed access to data said group is permitted to access. (Col 12 lines 10-33, 54-59).

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the system of Davis with the user account access control of Schneider because ACL's do not provide the level of security and flexibility that user accounts do.

Kuhn teaches using an access polict to provide tiered access for a plurality of security levels over different sets of users (Col 6 lines 35-60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Kuhn with the previous combination because it allows the convenience and organization of the role based system of Schneider with the proven security improvements of security levels (Col 5 lines 10-15).

Gupta teaches user preferences, and displaying new products or information related to the users field of interest based on those preferences [0062], [0064], [0075]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the preferences of Gupta with the previous system because it is more efficient to send the user tailored information, then send general information.

Claims 18, 23, 28, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis US 6,367,009 in view of Schneider US 6,178,505 in view of Kuhn US 6,023,765 in view of Ginzboorg US 6,240,091.

As per claims 18, 28 Davis does not teach a log system to record user actions in a computer site.

Ginzboorg discloses by means of charging records, a log system to record user interaction with a computer site including a digital signature and timestamp for a transaction, (Col 8 lines 22-26, Col 11 lines 17-21, Col 12 lines 24-28).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the access policy of Davis with the recording system of Ginzboorg to provide the necessary data for billing purposes

As per claims 23, and 33, Ginzboorg teaches an archive including purchases made (Ginzboorg Col 9 lines 50-55).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER J. BROWN whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571)272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Christopher J Brown/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2439

10/6/09